PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

RECEIVED

SEP 1 6 2005

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

Y; SHARPE, FAGAN, MNIGH & MERGE! FER

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing	
(day/month/year)	see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below

International application No. PCT/GB2004/001155

International filing date (day/month/year)

Priority date (day/month/year) 18.03.2003

18.03.2004 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

A61F2/06

Applicant

.)

To:

VERYAN MEDICAL LIMITED

1.	This opinion	contains	indications	relating to	the	following	items
----	--------------	----------	-------------	-------------	-----	-----------	-------

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

☑ Box No. II **Priority**

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. III

Lack of unity of invention ☐ Box No. IV

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial ☑ Box No. V

applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Certain documents cited ☐ Box No. VI

Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII

☑ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

Authorized Officer

European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Franz, V

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-6084



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/GB2004/001155

	Box No	
1.	With re	gard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in guage in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
	lar	is opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following guage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search and 23.1(b)).
2.	With re	gard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and ary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a. type	of material:
		a sequence listing
		table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b. form	at of material:
		in written format
		in computer readable form
	c. time	of filing/furnishing:
		contained in the international application as filed.
	Ċ	filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3	h. Ce	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating there as been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional opies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as opropriate, were furnished.
4	. Additi	onal comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/GB2004/001155

		II Deigrity				
	Box No		_			
1. [⊠ The	e following document ha				
	[\Box translation of the e	arlier appli	cation who	ose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).	
	Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.					
2.	This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.					
3.	Addition	nal observations, if nece	essary:			
	Box No	. V Reasoned state	ment und	er Rule 43	bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or ns supporting such statement	
			0110 0110 0	Хрішіші		
1.	Stateme	ent				
	Novelty	(N)		Claims	3,4,5,6,13,20 1,2,7,8,9-12,14-19	
			No:	Claims	1,2,7,0,8-12,14-18	
	Inventive step (IS)			Claims	2.45.6.12.20	
			No:	Claims	3,4,5,6,13,20	
	Industrial applicability (IA)			Claims	1-20	
			No:	Claims		
_	O't ation					
2. Citations and explanations						
	see sep	parate sheet				
					•	
	Box No	o. VII Certain defects	in the in	ternationa	l application	
Th	e follow	ing defects in the form	or contents	s of the inte	ernational application have been noted:	
	see sei	parate sheet				
	· - -	-				
	Box No				national application	

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1:WO00/38591 Tayride Care!
D2: EP1269935 "Case 6

D3: US2002/0116044

D4: WO00/49973 D5: WO99/17682

lack of novelty

- 1. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of independent claims 1 and 12 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- a. The document **D1** discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document): A stent for insertion in a fluid conduit of the human or animal body when the stent is in a collapsed condition and for expansion to an expanded condition (p. 5, l. 16-18), the stent comprising an outer wall for engagement with the conduit, the outer wall having a helical portion which in the expanded condition extends longitudinally and circumferentially (Fig. 3), and which, upon expansion of the stent from the collapsed condition to the expanded condition, resists extension (for expansion of every stent a certain resistive force has to be overcome). Thus, claim **1** is not novel.
- b. The only substantially different feature of independent claim 12 in respect to claim 1 is that the helical centre line has a helix angle less than or equal to 65°. Document **D1** shows this feature (p. 9, l. 27-p. 10, l. 4) as well as the other features of claim 12, so that claim **12** lacks novelty.
- c. Note that also document D2 anticipates the subject-matter of claims 1-3 and 5-19 while document D3 discloses the subject-matter of claims 1-9 (cf. International search report and the references cited therein). In particular, <u>all</u> stents with an expandability that along a certain line differs from the expandability along all other lines exhibit the features claimed in claims 1-8 because the applicant himself shows experimentally that by introducing a helical portion which resists extension during expansion of a stent, when expanded the stent will adopt a shape causing a fluid conduit which it supports to have a helical lumen (p. 23, I. 33-36 of the present application).
- d. Dependent claims 2-8 and 13-20 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty (claims 2, 7, 8, 14-19) or inventive step (claims 3-6, 13, 20), see documents D1-D4 and the corresponding passages cited in the search report.

Re Item VII

Certain defects in the international application

- 1. Independent claim 1 is not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features known in combination from the prior art (document D1) being placed in the preamble (Rule 6.3(b)(I) PCT) and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part (Rule 6.3(b)(ii) PCT).
- 2. The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (Rule 6.2(b) PCT).
- 3. Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in the documents D1 is not mentioned in the description, nor is this document identified therein.

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

- 1. The present application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 6 PCT because claims 1, 4, 8, and 9 are not clear.
- a. The expression used in claims 1 and 9, that the "helical portion ... resists extension" and the expression used in claim 4 that the helical portion has "bent portions which resist unbending" are unclear because every plastic material resists deformation. It is not specified if the resistance of a certain portion is larger than the resistance of another portion.
- Claim 8 is unclear because it is not specified which features lead to the desired result, i.e. expansion without substantial twisting.
- c. Claim **9** is unclear as a whole. It refers to "a balloon expandable stent, ..., the stent comprising a balloon". It is not clear whether this is an additional balloon or the balloon for expansion of the stent. In the first case actually a stent-graft would be claimed. In the second case a helical balloon for expansion of arbitrarily shaped stents would be claimed. For both versions no support in the description was found.